REMARKS

Present Status of the Application

The Office Action rejected claims 7 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter. In addition, claims 7 & 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Applicant Admitted Prior Art (Figure 1, hereinafter "AAPA"). The Office Action also objected to claims 7 & 8 based upon several informalities. Applicants respectfully traversed the rejections and objections addressed to claims 7 & 8 for at least the reasons set forth below.

Discussion of Objections

Claims 7 & 8 are objected to based upon the following discussions. Initially, it is noted with great appreciation that the Examiner considers the subject matter of claims 1-6 as being allowable over the art of record. In response thereto, Applicants have provided traversing as follows:

Paragraph [0025] of the present invention defines the "feed back" of the output of the amplifier 30 as the following: "Then, the output of the amplifier 30 is feed back to the high pass filter 22, i.e., the node 12." Therefore, based upon the above description in Paragraph [0025] and FIG. 3 of the present invention, it is evident then the output that is feed back at the node 12 is then sent to node 13 and "to the inverting-gain amplifier" in

claim 7 at only one possible coupling location without any ambiguity or indefiniteness. Thus no further amendments are required.

In view of the aforementioned traversing, Applicants respectfully assert that the objections to both claims 7 and 8 are no longer proper.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 112

The Office Action rejected claims 7 & 8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to point out and distinctly claim the subject matter.

With respect to claim 7, the recitation "receiving an input voltage using a low pass filter and a high pass filter" is traversed as follows: Based upon FIG. 3 and Paragraph [0023] of the present invention - which describes "...receiving an input voltage V_I...", V_I clearly the input voltage. Furthermore, only node 13 in FIG. 3 would qualify to fit the description at the receiving end of the above recitation of "receiving an input voltage using a low pass filter and a high pass filter" since going from node 12 to S_1 would mean that the high pass filter 22 is not being used; therefore, the path through S_1 cannot be part of the receiving portion for the above. As a result, it is clear that the node 13 to the amplifier 30, which is the correct device which fits the description of the above recitation.

Therefore, both claims 7 and 8 have recitation "receiving an input voltage using a low pass filter and a high pass filter" to be clearly and distinctly claimed, and should be allowed.

Discussion of the claim rejection under 35 USC 102

The Office Action rejected claims 7 & 8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by AAPA.

The claim limitation "feeding back the output signal of the inverting-gain amplifier to the inverting-gain amplifier **when there is a state change in the compared result.**" in claim 7 is clearly patentable over AAPA based on the following traversal.

Paragraph [0009] of the present invention defines "no state change" **specifically** in the following manner: "As a result, the voltage at the node 15 has **no state change** after time is greater than 122 microseconds...." In addition, FIG. 2 of the present invention also clear shows that there is **no state change** after time is greater than 122 microseconds. As a result, since AAPA in FIGs. 1 - 2 teaches that 14 is feeding back the output signal of 30 to 30 **even when** there is no state change after time is greater than 122 microseconds, the evidence shows that AAPA is feeding back the output signal of the inverting-gain amplifier to the inverting-gain amplifier even when there is **no** state change in the compared result (which is after time is greater than 122 microseconds). Therefore, claim 7 is clearly patentable over AAPA.

If independent claim 7 is allowable over the prior art of record, then its dependent claim 8 is allowable as a matter of law, because the dependent claim 8 contain all features of the its respective independent claim 7.

Customer No.: 31561
Application No.: 10/709,606
Docket No.: 12239-US-PA

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is believed that all the pending claims 1-8 of the present application patently define over the prior art and are in proper condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference would expedite the examination of the above-identified patent application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date : February 17, 2006

Belinda Lee

Belinda Lee
Registration No.: 46,863

Jianq Chyun Intellectual Property Office
7th Floor-1, No. 100
Roosevelt Road, Section 2
Taipei, 100
Taiwan
Tel: 011-886-2-2369-2800
Fax: 011-886-2-2369-7233
Email: belinda@jcipgroup.com.tw
Usa@jcipgroup.com.tw